

REMARKS

Although there is no specific legal requirement to include a summary of the invention, applicant has added a brief summary to overcome the examiner's objection. No new matter has been added.

The examiner uses Lipman to reject claims 23-32 as having been anticipated.

Claims 23 and 29 recite "a large table at a root, the root branching to nodes containing small trie tables, each trie table addressed by a span of Internet protocol (IP) address bits to locate an indexed trie entry, the indexed trie entry including a route pointer and a trie pointer," or similar language. At least this quoted claim feature is totally absent from Lipman.

Lipman discloses two routing tables, i.e., an uncompressed routing table (see FIG. 7) and a compressed routing table (see FIG. 8). Both of Lipman's routing tables are arranged into levels, i.e., Level-1, Level-2 and Level-3. Both of Lipman's routing tables include a single tree at a root. More specifically, with reference to FIG. 7, "(a) single tree 144 at level 1 contains pointers to level-1 routing entries 138." (col. 10, lines 55-56); with reference to FIG. 8, "(a) level 1, a single tree 150 has 64K 16-bit entries." (col. 13, line 15-16). This is different from applicant's claimed large table at a root. Accordingly, claims 23 and 29 are not anticipated by Lipman.

The examiner uses Lipman to reject claims 33-35 as having been obvious. Claim 29 is not rendered obvious by Lipman. Claims 33-35, depend upon, and further limit, claim 29. For example, claim 33 limits the large table at a root to a single 64k entry table that is indexed by bits 31:16 of an internet protocol (IP) address. Claim 34 limits a second large table to a single 256 entry table that is indexed by bits 31:24 of an internet protocol (IP) address. Claim 35 limits each of the small tables to a tree with each node representing 4 bits of addresses covering an extension of 1-4 bits of a prefix entry from a previous tree.


Further, as described above, Lipman does not teach or suggest a large table at a root. Accordingly, dependent claims 33-35 are not rendered obvious by Lipman.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment/cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment/cancellation.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2004



Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906